

ISSP study monitoring 2003: report to the ISSP General Assembly on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP by ZUMA, Germany

Scholz, Evi; Harkness, Janet; Faaß, Timo

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Verzeichnis, Liste, Dokumentation / list

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Scholz, E., Harkness, J., & Faaß, T. (2005). *ISSP study monitoring 2003: report to the ISSP General Assembly on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP by ZUMA, Germany*. (ZUMA-Methodenbericht, 2005/08). Mannheim: Zentrum für Umfragen, Methoden und Analysen -ZUMA-. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-48498-5>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer Deposit-Lizenz (Keine Weiterverbreitung - keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under Deposit Licence (No Redistribution - no modifications). We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

ZUMA Methodenbericht 2005/08
ISSP Study Monitoring 2003
Report to the ISSP General Assembly
on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP
by ZUMA, Germany
Evi Scholz, Janet Harkness and Timo Faaß

November 2005

ISSN 1610-9953

ZUMA
Quadrat B2, 1
Postfach 12 21 55
D- 68072 Mannheim

Telephone: Int+ 49+ (0) 621 1246-284,-272
Telefax: Int+ 49+ (0) 621 1246-100
E-mail: scholz@zuma-mannheim.de

Introduction

This report is based on the study monitoring survey conducted by ZUMA for the ISSP on the 2003 National Identity module.

Thirty-three member countries archived the 2003 National Identity module, all of them have completed the monitoring questionnaire. Details of the individual answers members provided are presented in the summary chart which follows here. We have done our best to summarise the answers we received and to check the information with members. Members were given the opportunity to make corrections before the report is made available on the Archive web site as a supplement to the 2003 Codebook.

The Study Monitoring Questionnaire (SMQ) has been modified from year to year. Questions on fieldwork, translation, and sampling have, for example, changed and questions on documentation been added. The latest version of the study monitoring questionnaire is appended. Some members used old versions of the SMQ they had kept. This means that some information for these countries is missing in the report. In order to avoid this in future, members are requested to contact ZUMA for the latest questionnaire in either online or word file format.

Summary of the findings

Language(s) and translation (see pages 1–6 of the Findings Chart)

From 1999 on, the SMQ asks whether members checked or evaluated their translations. All of the twenty-seven countries that produced translations checked or evaluated them (the Swiss Italian translation is an exception). Eighteen countries did not pre-test the translated questionnaire (Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Finland, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Poland, Norway, Russia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Uruguay, Spain, and Sweden). The Philippines and South Africa fielded in five languages, Switzerland and Israel in three languages and Canada, Finland, Latvia, and Slovakia in two languages. All the other member countries fielded in one language.

Some countries reported translation problems (Chile, Germany, Norway, Sweden and Venezuela).

Survey question coverage and context (see pages 7–8 of the Findings Chart)

Seven countries (Chile, Latvia, Poland, New Zealand, Slovenia, Taiwan, and South Africa) did not include all of the core items. Five members omitted background variables, usually by mistake.

In 2003, twenty-six countries fielded the ISSP module as part of a larger survey. A new question in the SMQ asking for information about accompanying studies (topic, study title, etc.) is included in the report (see appendix).

Sampling (see pages 9–12 of the Findings Chart)

The sampling procedures and details reported for the 2003 module are for the most part similar to those reported in earlier years. One country, Venezuela, seems to be using quota procedures at the stage of respondents' selection. Six reported using substitution of different kinds; Chile, Hungary, Latvia, the Philippines, Russia, and Spain.

Finland and France had a lower age cut-off at 15 years, Japan, Russia, and South Africa had a cut-off at 16 years; Sweden and Slovakia had a lower age cut-off at 17 years; all other members had a lower age cut-off at 18 years of age. Four countries reported an upper age cut-off (Finland at 74, Latvia at 75, Norway and Sweden at 79).

Data collection (see pages 13-18 of the Findings Chart)**MODES**

Essentially the ISSP questionnaires are administered as face-to-face interviews or in a self-completion format. Five countries combined several modes in fielding, usually as a result of fielding the ISSP module together with another study and administering the background variables for both studies face-to-face and the ISSP as self-completion (Denmark, Germany, Great Britain, Poland, and South Korea).

Three countries using an interviewer-administered mode had two advance contacts, letter and telephone call (Portugal, Switzerland and Taiwan). Six countries had advance letters (Germany, Great Britain, Hungary, Japan, Poland, and Slovenia), South Korea and the USA had a telephone pre-contact. Eight countries conducted their survey by mail (see table on page 13). Of these, Australia, New Zealand and Norway had four, Canada, Finland and Sweden had three, Denmark and France had two mailings. The number of mailings is usually seen as relevant for enhancing response (Dillman 2000). Sweden and Denmark had a telephone reminder. In Denmark, about 12% (158 of 1317) of the interviews were collected by telephone; the mode variable identifies these. Telephone interviews are not permitted in the

ISSP.

INCENTIVES

Eight countries reported they had used incentives (Great Britain, Japan, Norway, Russia, South Korea, Sweden, and Taiwan, USA). This information was not collected in the SMQ until the 2001 module.

FIELDING DATES

Dates of fielding for the 2003 module range from 2003 to 2005:

2003	22 countries
2003-2004	2 countries
2004	8 countries
2005	1 country

Spain had the shortest fielding period, with eight days, Portugal had the longest, with about 24 weeks.

In twenty of twenty-five countries using interviewer-administered modes, interviewers approached addresses or households at different times of day and at different days of the week; in three countries at different times of day only (Latvia, South Africa and South Korea), and in one country at different days in the week only (Slovak Republic). One country reported that none of these approaches was applied.

Countries differ considerably in the number of required contact attempts. The minimum required number of calls at an address or a household ranges from none (Switzerland, USA) to five (Austria, Ireland, Slovenia, and South Korea). Twelve countries supervised interviews (proportions ranging between 1%-38%). With one exception (Japan), countries using interviewer-administered modes back-checked interviews (proportions ranging between 2%-100%).

Information on response and outcome figures (see pages 19–20 of the Findings Chart)

Quota procedures, substitution, and, in some cases, a lack of sufficient detail are the three main obstacles to calculating response rates for some of the ISSP 2003 studies (cf. reasons mentioned in the Park and Jowell report (1997) and expanded in the overview of the 1996-1998 monitoring studies, Harkness, Langfeldt, and Scholz, 2001). Members also differ in their definitions of outcome codes – of what counts as “eligible“, “ineligible“, or “partially completed interviews“, and so forth.

The raw figures for eligible samples and final outcomes indicate, nevertheless, that the range in the ISSP is considerable – from under 20% to over 80% for the module.

Data (see pages 21-22 of the Findings Chart)

The great majority of members employed various measures of coding reliability, for the most part logic or consistency checks and range checks, followed by either individual or automatic corrections or both.

Eighteen of thirty-three countries applied subsequent weights or post-stratification to correct for errors of selection or response bias.

Documentation (see page 23 of the Findings Chart)

Nineteen countries reported they had a national methods report available (Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Germany, Great Britain, Hungary, Israel, Norway, Russia, Taiwan, the Philippines, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Korea, Sweden, Switzerland, and USA). This information was not collected in the SMQ until the 2001 module.

References

Dillman, D.A. (2000): Mail and Internet Surveys. The Tailored Design Method. 2. Edition. New York: Wiley.

Harkness, J., Langfeldt, B. and Scholz, E. (2001): ISSP Study Monitoring 1996-1998, Reports to the ISSP General Assembly on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP by ZUMA, Germany, Mai 2001. (available online with the 1996-1998 codebooks)

Park, A. and Jowell, R. (1997): Consistencies and differences in a cross-national survey. The International Social Survey Programme (1995). (available online with the 1995 codebook)

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2003
(based on Central Archive and ZUMA documentation, March, 2005: Australia to Denmark)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report	Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Australia (1984)	1996	✓	No	Canada (1991)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	No			1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	No			2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	No	
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
Austria (1985)	1996	No	No	Chile (1997)	1996		
	1997	✓			1997		
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
Bangladesh (1997) - (2003)	1996		No	Cyprus (1995)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓			1997	✓	✓
	1998	No			1998	✓	No
	1999	No			1999	✓	✓
	2000	(TP)	No		2000	No	
	2001	No			2001	✓	✓
Brazil (1999)	2002	No			2002	✓	✓
	1996				2003	No	
	1997			Czech Republic (1991)	1996	✓	✓
	1998	(TP)	(✓)		1997	✓	✓
	1999	(TP)	(✓)		1998	✓	✓
	2000	No			1999	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2003	No			2002	✓	✓
					2003	✓	✓
Bulgaria (1991)	1996	✓	✓	Denmark (1998)	1996		
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	No			2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓

TP: Data not archived as part of merged ISSP data set because of technical problems with sampling, fielding, or late archiving.

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2003
(based on Central Archive and ZUMA documentation, March, 2005: Finland to Japan)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Finland (2000)	1996		
	1997		
	1998		
	1999		
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓
Flanders (2000)	1996		
	1997		
	1998		
	1999		
	2000		
	2001		
	2002	✓	✓
	2003	No	
France (1995)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	No	
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓
Germany (1984)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓
Great Britain & Northern Ireland* (1984)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Hungary (1986)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	No	
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓
Ireland (1986)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	(TP)	(✓)
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓
Israel (1988)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓
Italy (2001-2004)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	(No)	
	2000	(No)	
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	No	
	2003	No	
Japan (1991)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓

TP: Data not archived as part of merged ISSP data set because of technical problems with sampling, fielding, or late archiving.

* 2003 without Northern Ireland

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2003
(based on Central Archive and ZUMA documentation, March, 2005: Latvia to Slovak Republic)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report	Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Latvia (1997)	1996	✓	✓	Philippines (1989)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	No			1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
Mexico (2000)	1996			Poland (1992)	1996	✓	✓
	1997				1997	✓	✓
	1998				1998	✓	✓
	1999				1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	No	
	2001	No			2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
Netherlands (1985)	2003	No			2003	✓	✓
	1996	No		Portugal (1995)	1996	No	
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	(TP)	(✓)		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	No			2003	✓	✓
New Zealand (1990)	1996	✓	✓	Russia (1990)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
Norway (1988)	1996	✓	✓	Slovak Republic (1996, re- instated)	1996	No	
	1997	✓	✓		1997	No	
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	No	
	2001	✓	✓		2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓

TP: Data not archived as part of merged ISSP data set because of technical problems with sampling, fielding, or late archiving.

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2003
(based on Central Archive and ZUMA documentation, March, 2005: Slovenia to Venezuela)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report	Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Slovenia (1992)	1996	✓	✓	Switzerland (1999)	1996		
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	No
	1999	✓	✓		1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
South Africa (2001, re- instated)	1996			Taiwan (2001)	1996		
	1997				1997		
	1998				1998		
	1999				1999		
	2000				2000		
	2001	✓	✓		2001		
South Korea (2003)	2002	No			2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	1996			Uruguay (2003)	1996		
	1997				1997		
	1998				1998		
	1999				1999		
	2000				2000		
	2001				2001		
Spain (1993)	2002				2002		
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	1996	✓	✓	USA (1984)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
Sweden (1992)	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	1996	✓	✓	Venezuela (1999)	1996		
	1997	✓	✓		1997		
	1998	✓	✓		1998		
	1999	✓	✓		1999	No	
	2000	✓	✓		2000	No	
	2001	No			2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓		2002	No	
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓

TP: Data not archived as part of merged ISSP data set because of technical problems with sampling, fielding, or late archiving.

Monitoring Findings Chart
2003
for

Austria (A)
Australia (AUS)
Bulgaria (BG)
Canada (CDN)
Switzerland (CH)
Chile (CL)
Czech Republic (CZ)
Germany (D)
Denmark (DK)
Spain (E)
France (F)
Finland (FIN)
Great Britain (GB)
Hungary (H)
Israel (IL)
Ireland (IRL)
Japan (J)
Latvia (LV)
Norway (N)
New Zealand (NZ)
Portugal (P)
Poland (PL)
South Korea (ROK)
Uruguay (ROU)
The Philippines (RP)
Russia (RUS)
Sweden (S)
Slovak Republic (SK)
Slovenia (SLO)
Taiwan (TW)
United States of America (USA)
Venezuela (YV)
South Africa (ZA)

Language(s) and translation

	A	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	IL	IRL
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>																
Language 1 (L1)	German	English	Bulgarian	English	German	Spanish	Czech	German	Danish	Spanish	French	Finnish	English	Hungarian	Hebrew	English
Language 2 (L2)				French	French							Swedish			Arab	
Language 3 (L3)					Italian										Russian	
<i>Was the questionnaire translated?</i>																
Yes, translated:	X ^A															
- by member(s) of research team					L1, L2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		
- by translation bureau			X													
- by specially trained translator(s)			X	L2	L3	X		X				X			X	
No, not translated		X											X			X

^A Austria used the German (ZUMA) translation.

Translation (continued)

	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>																	
Language 1 (L1)	Japanese	Latvian	Norwegian	English	Portuguese	Polish	Korean	Spanish	Tagalog	Russian	Swedish	Slovak	Slovenian	Chinese	English	Spanish	English
Language 2 (L2)		Russian							Ilocano			Hungarian					Afrikaans
Language 3 (L3)									Bicolano								Zulu
Language 4 (L4)									Cebuano								Venda
Language 5 (L5)									Ilonggo								Tswana
<i>Was the questionnaire translated?</i>																	
Yes, translated:																	
- by member(s) of research team	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	L1		X		X	X			L3, L4, L5
- by translation bureau	X											X				X	
- by specially trained translator(s)						X				X	X						L2
- other									L 1-5								
No, not translated				X											X		L1

Translation (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	IL	IRL
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>																
Language 1 (L1)	German	English	Bulgarian	English	German	Spanish	Czech	German	Danish	Spanish	French	Finnish	English	Hungarian	Hebrew	English
Language 2 (L2)				French	French							Swedish			Arab	
Language 3 (L3)					Italian										Russian	
<i>Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?</i>																
Yes:																
- group discussion			X		L1, L2	X	X	X			X	X		X	X	
- expert checked it			X					X		X	X	X				
- back translation				L2												
- other									X	X						
No					L3											
Not applicable	X ^A	X											X			X

^A Austria used the German (ZUMA) translation.

Translation (continued)

	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>																	
Language 1 (L1)	Japanese	Latvian	Norwegian	English	Portuguese	Polish	Korean	Spanish	Tagalog	Russian	Swedish	Slovak	Slovenian	Chinese	English	Spanish	English
Language 2 (L2)		Russian							Ilocano			Hungarian					Afrikaans
Language 3 (L3)									Bicolano								Zulu
Language 4 (L4)									Cebuano								Venda
Language 5 (L5)									Ilonggo								Tswana
<i>Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?</i>																	
Yes:																	
- group discussion		X	X		X	X	X	X	L 1-5		X		X	X		X	L4,L5
- expert checked it						X				X		X		X			
- back translation									L 1-5								L2,L3
- other	X								L 2-5						X		
Not applicable				X													L1

Translation (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	IL	IRL
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>																
Language 1 (L1)	German	English	Bulgarian	English	German	Spanish	Czech	German	Danish	Spanish	French	Finnish	English	Hungarian	Hebrew	English
Language 2 (L2)				French	French							Swedish			Arabic	
Language 3 (L3)					Italian										Russian	
<i>Was the questionnaire pre-tested?</i>																
Yes			X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	
No				L2			X									
Not applicable	X ^A	X											X			X
<i>Were there any questions... which caused problems when translating?</i>																
Yes						X		X								
No			X	L2	X		X		X	X	X	X		X	X	
Not applicable	X ^A	X											X			X

^A Austria used the German (ZUMA) translation.

Translation (continued)

	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>																	
Language 1 (L1)	Japanese	Latvian	Norwegian	English	Portuguese	Polish	Korean	Spanish	Tagalog	Russian	Swedish	Slovak	Slovenian	Chinese	English	Spanish	English
Language 2 (L2)		Russian							Ilocano			Hungarian					Afrikaans
Language 3 (L3)									Bicolano								Zulu
Language 4 (L4)									Cebuano								Venda
Language 5 (L5)									Ilongg								Tswana
<i>Was the questionnaire pre-tested?</i>																	
Yes					X		X		L 1-5	X	X	X	X	X		X	
No	X	X	X			X		X									L 2-5
Not applicable				X											X		L1
<i>Were there any questions... which caused problems when translating?</i>																	
Yes			X								X					X	
No	X	X			X	X	X	X	L 1-5	X		X	X	X			L 2-5
Not applicable				X											X		L1

Survey context

	A	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>How was the ISSP module fielded?</i>																																	
Individual survey							X		X		X				X		X										X						
Larger survey:																																	
- with ISSP at start	X		X	X												X			X	X	X							X					X
- with ISSP in middle		X				X				X			X					X						X	X					X			
- with ISSP at end					X			X						X								X	X		X	X					X		

Question coverage and order

	A	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
Were the ISSP questions asked in prescribed order?																																	
Yes	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X
No						X		X																									
Were all the core ISSP items included?																																	
Yes, all included	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X		
No, not all included:																																	
- from module						X												X		X		X							X			X	
- background items				X													X					X											

Sampling

	A	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>The sample was designed to be representative of...</i>																																	
...only adult citizens of country	X	X	X			X				X ^E		X		X		X	X							X		X		X		X			
...adults of any nationality				X	X		X	X	X		X		X		X				X	X		X			X			X		X			X
<i>Was your sample designed to be representative of adults living in...</i>																																	
...private accommodation only	X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X
...private & institutional accommodation		X							X			X					X			X													
Question not asked										X																							
<i>Lower age cut-off</i>																																	
18	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X		X				X	X		X		X		X		X		X			
17																																	
16																	X										X						
15											X																						X

^E Spain used an older version of study monitoring questionnaire which does not distinguish between citizens and population

Sampling (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
Was there an upper age cut-off?																																	
Yes																																	
Age																																	
No	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X			79	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	
Did you use any variables for stratification?																																	
Yes		X		X	X	X	X	X		X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X							
No	X		X						X		X	X				X				X			X				X						
How many stages does your sampling design have?																																	
One stage		X		X					X			X							X	X						X							
Two stages			X					X		X							X																
Three stages											X		X	X							X	X	X	X	X ^{RP}		X			X	X	X	
Four or more stages	X									X					X			X							X ^{RP}	X				X			
Question not asked																																	

^{RP} The Philippines used two different sampling methods; for the capital region, the sampling design has three stages, for the rest of the Philippines five stages; for more information see Study Description Sheet.

Sampling (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
Does your sampling frame consist of...																																	
Addresses			X								X		X		X			X			X					X							
Households	X				X ^{CH}		X																X					X					
Named individuals (target persons)		X		X ^{CDN}				X	X			X		X			X			X		X											
Named individuals (not the target persons)												X				X																	
Areas										X ^E														X								X	
Something else						X																											
What selection method was used to identify a respondent?																																	
Kish grid			X		X	X	X			X		X			X									X							X		
Birthday method											X					X		X			X		X			X					X		
Quota																																	
Other	X ^A																																
Not applicable		X		X				X	X			X		X			X			X		X						X					

^{CH} Telephone directory extended with mobile phone but excluding prepaid numbers.

^{CDN} Telephone book.

^E Census section.

^A Random sampling.

Sampling (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage of selection process or during fieldwork?																																	
Yes						X ^{1,2,3}				X ^{1,2}				X				X							X ^{1,2,3}	X							
No	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X

¹ Substitution of refusals

² Substitution of non-contacts, people away during survey period, etc.

³ Substitution of sample points

Data collection

	A	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Data collection methods used (substantive & background) ?</i>																																	
Face-to-face	X		X		X	X	X	X ^b		X		X ^b	X ^b	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X ^b	X ^{ROK}	X	X		X		X		X	X	
Self-Completion (with interviewer involvement)								X ^s					X ^s									X ^s	X ^{ROK}			X				X			
Self-completion by mail		X		X					X		X	X								X													
Telephone								X	X																								
<i>Length of fieldwork</i>																																	
2 weeks or less			X							X				X			X	X				X			X			X				X	
Over 2 wks < 1 month																																	
1 month < 2 mths	X			X								X				X				X			X	X				X				X	
2 months < 3 mths															X								X										
3 mths or more		X			X			X	X		X		X							X	X		X							X			
<i>Year of fieldwork</i>																																	
2003		X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X		X	X		X	
2004	X			X				X													X				X			X					
2005				X				X	X						X						X							X					

^b background variables

^s substantive variables

ROK 1150 interviews face-to-face; 165 self-completion

Data collection: face-to-face and self-administered with some interviewer involvement

	A	BG	CH	CL	CZ	D	E	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Were postal or telephone components used?</i>																									
Yes - postal components:																									
- advance letter			X		X			X	X			X		X	X						X	X			
- reminder & thank you letters																									
Yes - telephone components			X											X		X						X	X		
No	X	X		X	X		X			X	X		X				X	X	X	X				X	X
<i>Were incentives offered?</i>																									
Yes																									
No	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Question not asked							X																		
<i>Were interviewers paid according to realized cases?</i>																									
Yes	X	X	X	X	X	X ^D	X ^E	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No																		X					X		

^D Interviewers are paid per interview plus expenses

^E Interviewers are paid per day, per completed interview plus payment for non-completed interviews

Data collection: face-to-face and self-administered with some interviewer involvement (continued)

	A	BG	CH	CL	CZ	D	E	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Which of these rules governed how an interviewer approached an address or house-hold?</i>																									
Call at different time of day		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Call on different days in week		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
None of these	X																								
<i>Were a minimum number of calls required?</i>																									
Yes:																									
Minimum number of required calls	5	3		3	3	4	3	4	3	4	5	3	2	4	3	5	3	2	3	3	5	3	3	3	3
No			X																				X		
<i>Were any interviews supervised?</i>																									
Yes:																									
Approximate proportion (%)		7		7.5	30		28 ^E	14								8	38	10					1	5	15
No	X		X			X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X	X			10

^E 28% of interviews jointly supervised and partially back-checked

Data collection: face-to-face and self-administered with some interviewer involvement (continued)

	A	BG	CH	CL	CZ	D	E	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
Were any interviews back-checked?																									
Yes:																									
Approximate proportion (%)	15	7	20	40	2	100	28 ^E	10	10	30	10		10	30	7	57.5	100	30	15	7	60	40	20	20	10
No												X													

^E 28% of interviews jointly supervised and partially back-checked

Data collection: mail

	AUS	CDN	DK	F	FIN	N	NZ	S
<i>Were any contacts made by telephone or interviewer?</i>								
Yes:								
- reminders by telephone			X ^{DK}					X
No	X	X		X	X	X	X	
<i>What was sent out in the first mailing?</i>								
Questionnaire	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Data protection information	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Explanatory letter	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Incentive						X		
Other material		X					X	
<i>What was sent out in the second mailing?</i>								
Thank you and reminder combined		X		X	X	X		
Reminder sent only to non-respondents	X		X				X	
Questionnaire			X	X			X	X
Data protection information				X			X	
Explanatory letter				X			X	
Other material	X						X	X ^S

^{DK} Denmark used a telephone reminder after last mailing.

^S Sweden sent out incentive in the second mailing.

Data collection: mail (continued)

	AUS	CDN	DK	F	FIN	N	NZ	S
<i>What was sent out in the third mailing?</i>								
Questionnaire	X	X			X	X	X	X
Data protection information	X				X	X		X
Explanatory letter	X	X			X	X	X	
Other material					X ^N	X	X	
No third mailing			X	X				
<i>What was sent out in the fourth (or last) mailing?</i>								
Questionnaire					X			
Data protection information					X			
Explanatory letter					X	X	X	
Reminder only to non-respondents	X							
No fourth mailing		X	X	X	X			X

^N Norway also sent out incentive in third and fourth mailing.

Information on response and outcome figures *

	A	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D ^D	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	IL	IRL
<i>Response figures based on reported figures</i>																
Issued sample (n)	2200	5684	1200	3000	3640	1505	2441	2450/1130	2000	1230	10000	2500	2062	1684	1850	1702
Ineligible (n)	531	38	17	126	201	5	52	264/127	8		128	12	182	205	77	88
Eligible (n)	1669	5646	1183	2874	3439	1500	2389	2186/1003	1992	1230	9872	2488	1880	1479	1773	1614
- refusal (n)	278	343	35	40	1735	91	617	924/415	430	9		8	569	282	431	252
- non-contact (n)	385	2374		1596	319	77	297	153/63	40	7	8148	1095	79	72	206	220
- other unproductive (n)		758	79		348	24	199	132/40	200	2		6	359	104	69	52
- completed cases (n)	1006	2165	1069	1228	1037	1505/1308 ^{CL}	1276	850/437	1317 ^{DK}	1212	1669	1379	873	1021	1066	1065
- partially completed (n)		6		10				127/48	5		55				1	25

* for calculation of response figures, see appendix.

^D Western federal states followed by eastern federal states

^{CL} First count includes substituted interviews

^{DK} 158 telephone interviews included (12% of interviews completed)

Information on response and outcome figures (continued)*

	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Response figures based on reported figures</i>																	
Issued sample (n)	1800	1805	2500	2200	2907	2106	2000	1389		5902	2000	1475	1612	4391	2587	1337	3500
Ineligible (n)	99	96	50	224	99	204	30			182	35	16	102	174	792	43	250
Eligible (n)	1701	1709	2450	1976	2808	1902	1970	1389		5720	1965	1459	1510	4217	1795	1294	3250
- refusal (n)	272	285	82	70	955	218	591	176	409	1632	172	307	204	607	258	54	362
- non-contact (n)	182	377	862	779	200	113	64	72	995	1103	451		101	1197	49	29	333
- other unproductive (n)	145	47	37	89	46	294		33	242	556	156		112	397	272	12	72
- completed cases (n)	1102	994	1469	1038	1602	1277	1315	1108	1200	2408	1186	1152	1092	2016	1216	1199	2464
- partially completed (n)		6			5					21			1				19

* for calculation of response figures, see appendix.

Data

	A	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA	
Were any measures of coding reliability employed?																																		
Yes	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X	
No				X	X												X			X	X					X		X						
Was the keying of the data verified?																																		
Yes:									X																									
Approximate proportion (%)					100	100	100			25	1	100	100	100	15	100	100		20		15		100		100		10			100		100	100	
No	X	X	X	X				X			X							X		X	X	X		X	X	X				X				
Not answered																																		
Were any reliability checks made on derived variables?																																		
Yes		X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X			X	X		X	
No	X		X	X										X	X	X																		
Not applicable																										X								

Data (continued)

	A	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
Data checks/edits on:																																	
	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X	
	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Were data errors corrected?																																	
Yes:																																	
- individually	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
- automatically	X		X							X				X			X		X	X	X					X				X	X	X	
No																																	
Not answered																																	
Were the data weighted or post-stratified?																																	
Yes	X			X	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X			X	X		X		X	X	X	
No		X	X					X	X														X	X									

Documentation

	A	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CL	CZ	D	DK	E	F	FIN	GB	H	IL	IRL	J	LV	N	NZ	P	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	YV	ZA
<i>Is a national methods report available for your study?</i>																																	
Yes	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No											X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X			X									
Question not asked										X																							

Appendix

Please provide information about the other study(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name).		
1	Austria	Fielded together with ISSP 2004 (Citizenship) with additional EU-questions and identity questions (big 5, etc.).
2	Australia	The Australian Survey of Social Attitudes (AuSSA) 2003: a biennial general social survey of Australian attitudes on subjects including work, education, families, crime, community, and taxes and government spending.
3	Bulgaria	Roma issues in Bulgaria.
4	Canada	Fielded together with ISSP 2004 (Citizenship).
5	Chile	ISSP 2003 (National Identity) module was carried out in conjunction with questions relating to Chilean political, economic and social attitudes.
6	Germany	ISSP 2003 was fielded together with ISSP 2004 (Citizenship) and with ALLBUS (German General Social Survey). The ALLBUS 2004 deals with various topics, such as health, social inequality or digital divide.
7	Great Britain	Fielded as part of the British Social Attitudes Survey.
8	Hungary	The module was part of TARKI's 2003/3 Omnibus survey. The ISSP questions were placed in the second half of questionnaire. The first 200 questions were devoted to some other issues mostly on telecommunication (use of mobiles, internet, etc.). Then, the questionnaire continued with background variables. The exact ISSP part started with Q239 and ended with Q255. After the ISSP section the questionnaire contained further background information.
9	Ireland	Fielded together with ISSP 2004 (Citizenship).
10	Latvia	ISSP 2003 (part B) was fielded together with the module 2002 (part A) and a study including questions on medical care (part C).
11	Norway	Omnibus for Norwegian researchers (30 items) on: national symbols political cleavages, political trust, political efficacy, political activity, state church as national institution.
12	New Zealand	New Zealand specific questions on National Identity: race relations, the Treaty of Waitangi, immigration, the Maori language.
13	Portugal	A module on attitudes towards immigration was added to the questionnaire.
14	Poland	Fielded together with the Polish General Social Survey (PGSS).

Please provide information about the other study(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name).		
15	The Philippines	ISSP 2003 is part of an omnibus survey. Other topics are quality of life, voter preferences for May 2004 elections, performance rating of the president and the national administration as a whole and on specific issues, such as corruption in government, right to information. The ISSP module run from question nos. 84 to 143.
16	Russia	Regular omnibus.
17	Slovak Republic	Religious identity, regional identity, gender identity.
18	Slovenia	ISSP 2003 fielded together with ISSP 2002 (Family and Changing Gender Roles) and national survey on attitudes on local democracy
19	South Africa	The module was fielded as part of the South African Social Attitudes Survey (SASAS). Topics included: democracy and governance, national identity (not ISSP), public service, health status, HIV/Aids, moral issues and communications.
20	South Korea	ISSP 2003 module (National Identity) was fielded as part of the KGSS (Korean General Social Survey).
21	Spain	Question not asked in older version of SMQ.
22	Switzerland	The ISSP was fielded together with the “Eurobarometer in Switzerland (EBCH)”. The topic of the EBCH of 2003 was “Family” which corresponds to the EB59.0 of the European Union.
23	Taiwan	National identity, political attitudes, democracy, etc.
24	Uruguay	Fielded together with ISSP 2004 (Citizenship).
25	USA	Fielded as a part of the General Social Survey.
26	Venezuela	Other study on violence and criminal justice system.

Calculation of Response Figures Based on Reported Figures

Report Category	Face-to-Face Questionnaire Category	Mail Questionnaire Category
Issued sample (n)	Total number of starting or issued names/addresses (gross sample size)	Total number of starting or issued names/addresses (gross sample size)
Ineligible (n)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Addresses which could not be traced at all/ selected respondents who could not be traced - Addresses established as empty, demolished or containing no private dwellings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Addresses which could not be traced - Addresses established as empty, demolished or containing no private dwellings - Details of address wrong (street numbers, post codes, etc.) - Addresses with no letter boxes - Selected respondent unknown at address - Selected respondent moved, no forwarding address - Selected respondent deceased
Eligible (n)	Issued sample minus Ineligible	Issued sample minus Ineligible
Refusal (n)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Personal refusal at selected address - Proxy refusal (on behalf of selected respondent) - Other refusal at selected address 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Refusal by selected respondent - Refusal by another person - Implicit refusals (empty envelopes, empty questionnaires returned)
Non-contact (n)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No contact at selected address - No contact with selected person 	No contact
Other unproductive (n)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Selected respondent too sick / incapacitated to participate - Selected respondent had inadequate understanding of language of survey - Selected respondent away during survey period - Other type of unproductive reaction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Selected respondent too sick / incapacitated to participate - Selected respondent had inadequate understanding of language of survey - Selected respondent away during survey period - Other type of unproductive reaction
Completed cases (n)	Full productive interview	Completed returned questionnaires (net sample size)
Partially completed (n)	Partial productive interview	Partially completed returned questionnaires